arXiv:1411.6563v1 [math.AC] 24 Nov 2014

HOMOLOGICAL DIMENSIONS WITH RESPECT TO A SEMIDUALIZING COMPLEX

JONATHAN TOTUSHEK

Abstract. In this paper we build off of Takahashi and White's $\mathcal{P}_C$-projective dimension and $\mathcal{I}_C$-injective dimension to define these dimensions for when C is a semidaulizing complex. We develop the framework for these homological dimensions by establishing base change results and local-global behavior. Furthermore, we investigate how these dimensions interact with other invariants.

1. Introduction

Let R be a commutative noetherian ring. The projective, flat, and injective dimensions of an R-module M are now classical invariants that are important for studying M and R. These dimensions were later generalized for R-complexes by Foxby [3] and many useful results about dimensions for modules also hold true for complexes.

A finitely generated R-module C is *semidualizing* if $R \cong \operatorname{Hom}_R(C,C)$ and $\operatorname{Ext}^{\geqslant 1}_R(C,C) = 0$. Takahashi and White [10] defined, for a semidualizing R-module C, the $\mathcal{P}_C$-projective and $\mathcal{I}_C$-injective dimensions. The *$\mathcal{P}_C$-projective dimension* of an R-module M ($\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(M)$) is the length of the shortest resolution of M by modules of the form $C \otimes_R P$ where P is a projective module. They define *$\mathcal{I}_C$-injective dimension* ($\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(M)$) dually, and one defines the *$\mathcal{F}_C$-projective dimension* ($\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(M)$) similarly. We extend these constructions to the realm of R-complexes. Note that we work in the derived category $\mathcal{D}(R)$. See Section 2 for some background and notation on this subject.

A complex $C \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{f}}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ is *semidualizing* if the natural homothety morphism $\chi^R_C : R \to \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,C)$ is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{D}(R)$. To understand the $\mathcal{P}_C$-projective, $\mathcal{F}_C$-projective, and $\mathcal{I}_C$-injective dimensions in this context, we use the following result; see Theorem 3.9 below.

Theorem 1.1. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$, and let C be a semidualizing R-complex.*

(a) *We have $\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)) < \infty$ if and only if there exists $Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ such that $\operatorname{pd}_R(Y) < \infty$ and $X \simeq C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y$ in $\mathcal{D}(R)$. When these conditions are satisfied, one has $Y \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)$ and $X \in \mathcal{B}_C(R)$.*

(b) *We have $\operatorname{fd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)) < \infty$ if and only if there exists $Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ such that $\operatorname{fd}_R(Y) < \infty$ and $X \simeq C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y$ in $\mathcal{D}(R)$. When these conditions are satisfied, one has $Y \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)$ and $X \in \mathcal{B}_C(R)$.*

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13D02, 13D05, 13D09.

Key words and phrases. Auslander class, Bass class, flat dimension, injective dimension, projective dimension, semidualizing complex.

This material is based on work supported by North Dakota EPSCoR and National Science Foundation Grant EPS-0814442.

(c) *We have* $\mathrm{id}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X) < \infty$ *if and only if there exists* $Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ *such that* $\mathrm{id}_R(Y) < \infty$ *and* $X \simeq \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(C, Y)$ *in* $\mathcal{D}(R)$. *When these conditions are satisfied, one has* $Y \simeq C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X$ *and* $X \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$.

With this in mind, we define e.g., $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) := \sup(C) + \operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(C, X)$; thus $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$ if and only if X satisfies the equivalent conditions of Theorem 1.1(a). We define $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X)$ and $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X)$ similarly.

In Section 3 we develop the foundations of these homological dimensions. For instance, we establish finite flat dimension base change (3.11) and local-global principles (3.16-3.18). Also in Theorem 3.10 we show how these notions naturally augment Foxby Equivalence. In Section 4 we establish some stability results and the following; see Theorem 4.9.

Theorem 1.2. *Assume* R *has a dualizing complex* D *and let* $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. *Then* $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$ *if and only if* $\mathcal{I}_{C^\dagger}\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X) < \infty$ *where* $C^\dagger = \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(C, D)$.

This result is key for the work in [9].

2. Background

Throughout this paper R and S are commutative noetherian rings with identity and C is a semidualizing R-complex.

We work in the derived category $\mathcal{D}(R)$ of complexes of R-modules, indexed homologically (see e.g. [5, 6]). A complex $X \in \mathcal{D}(R)$ is *homologically bounded if* $\mathrm{H}_i(X) = 0$ for all $|i| \gg 0$ and X is *homologically finite* if $\oplus_i \mathrm{H}_i(X)$ is finitely generated. We denote by $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ and $\mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{f}}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ the full subcategories of $\mathcal{D}(R)$ consisting of all homologically bounded R-complexes and all homologically finite R-complexes, respectively. Isomorphisms in $\mathcal{D}(R)$ are identified by the symbol $\simeq$.

For R-complexes X and Y, let $\inf(X)$ and $\sup(X)$ denote the infimum and supremum, respectively, of the set $\{i \in \mathbb{Z} \mid \mathrm{H}_i(X) = 0\}$. Let $X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y$ and $\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(X, Y)$ denote the left-derived tensor product and right-derived homomorphism complexes, respectively.

Definition 2.1. Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_+(R)$. The *projective dimension* of X is

$$\operatorname{pd}_R(X) = \inf\left\{ n \in \mathbb{Z} \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} P \xrightarrow{\simeq} X \text{ where } P \text{ is a complex of projective} \\ R\text{-modules such that } P_i = 0 \text{ for all } i > n \end{array} \right\}.$$

The *flat dimension* (fd) and *injective dimension* (id) are defined similarly. Let $\mathcal{P}(R)$, $\mathcal{F}(R)$, and $\mathcal{I}(R)$ denote the full subcategories of $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ consisting of complexes of finite projective, flat, and injective dimensions, respectively.

Fact 2.2 ([1, Proposition 4.5])**.** Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}(R)$.

(a) If $\mathrm{id}_R(Y) < \infty$, then $\operatorname{fd}_R(\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(X, Y)) \leqslant \mathrm{id}_R(X) + \sup(Y)$.
(b) If $\operatorname{fd}_R(Y) < \infty$, then $\mathrm{id}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y) \leqslant \mathrm{id}_R(X) - \inf(Y)$.

The following result is for use in Section 4.

Lemma 2.3. *Let* $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$.

(a) *If* I *is a faithfully injective* R*-module and* $\mathrm{id}_R(\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(X, E)) \leqslant n$, *then we have* $\operatorname{fd}_R(X) \leqslant n$.
(b) *If* F *is a faithfully flat* R*-module and* $\operatorname{fd}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R F) \leqslant n$, *then* $\operatorname{fd}_R(X) \leqslant n$.
(c) *If* E *is a faithfully injective* R*-module and* $\mathrm{id}_R(X) \leqslant n$, *then we have that* $\operatorname{fd}_R(\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(X, E)) \leqslant n$.

(d) *If F is a faithfully flat R-module and* $\operatorname{id}_R(X) \leqslant n$, *then* $\operatorname{id}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R E) \leqslant n$.

Proof: (a) Assume that $\operatorname{id}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,E)) \leqslant n$ and let $F \xrightarrow{\simeq} X$ be a flat resolution. A standard truncation argument shows that $\operatorname{Hom}_R(\operatorname{Coker}(\partial^F_{n+1}), E)$ is injective. Since E is faithfully injective, we also have that $\operatorname{Coker}(\partial^F_{n+1})$ is flat. Thus $\operatorname{fd}_R(X) \leqslant n$.

The proofs of (b), (c), and (d) are similar. □

Fact 2.4 ([1, Lemma 4.4])**.** Let $L, M, N \in \mathcal{D}(R)$. Assume that $L \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{f}}_{+}(R)$.

The natural *tensor-evaluation* morphism

$$\omega_{LMN} : \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(L,M) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R N \to \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(L, M \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R N)$$

is an isomorphism when $M \in \mathcal{D}_-(R)$ and either $L \in \mathcal{P}(R)$ or $N \in \mathcal{F}(R)$.

The natural *Hom-evaluation* morphism

$$\theta_{LMN} : L \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(M,N) \to \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(L,M), N)$$

is an isomorphism when $M \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ and either $L \in \mathcal{P}(R)$ or $N \in \mathcal{I}(R)$.

Definition 2.5 (Foxby Classes)**.**

(1) The *Auslander Class* with respect to C is the full subcategory $\mathcal{A}_C(R) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ such that a complex X is in $\mathcal{A}_C(R)$ if and only if $C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ and the natural morphism $\gamma^C_X : X \to \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X)$ is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{D}(R)$.

(2) The *Bass Class* with respect to C is the full subcategory $\mathcal{B}_C(R) \subseteq \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ such that a complex Y is in $\mathcal{B}_C(R)$ if and only if $\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,Y) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ and the natural morphism $\xi^C_Y : C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,Y) \to Y$ is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{D}(R)$.

For a generalized diagramatic version of the next result, see Theorem 3.10.

Fact 2.6 (Foxby Equivalence [2, Theorem 4.6])**.** Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$.

(a) One has $X \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$ if and only if $C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X \in \mathcal{B}_C(R)$.
(b) One has $Y \in \mathcal{B}_C(R)$ if and only if $\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,Y) \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$.

Fact 2.7 ([2, Proposition 4.4])**.** Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$.

(a) If $\operatorname{fd}_R(X) < \infty$ (e.g., $\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$), then $X \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$.
(b) If $\operatorname{id}_R(X) < \infty$, then $X \in \mathcal{B}_C(R)$.

3. C-Dimensions for Complexes

In this section we define for the $\mathcal{P}_C$-projective, $\mathcal{F}_C$-projective, and $\mathcal{I}_C$-injective dimensions and build their foundations.

Definition 3.1. Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$.

(1) The *$\mathcal{P}_C$-projective dimension* of X is defined as

$$\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) = \sup(C) + \operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)).$$

(2) The *$\mathcal{F}_C$-projective dimension* of X is defined as

$$\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) = \sup(C) + \operatorname{fd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)).$$

(3) The *$\mathcal{I}_C$-injective dimension* of X is defined as

$$\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X) = \sup(C) + \operatorname{id}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X).$$

Let $\mathcal{P}_C(R)$, $\mathcal{F}_C(R)$, and $\mathcal{I}_C(R)$ denote the full subcategories of $\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ of all complexes of finite C-projective, C-flat, and C-injective dimension, respectively.

Remark 3.2. Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. Observe that $\sup(C) < \infty$. Hence $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$ if and only if $\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)) < \infty$. If $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$, then Fact 2.7(a) implies that $\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X) \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$ and Foxby Equivalence (2.6) implies that $X \in \mathcal{B}_C(R)$. Similarly, $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$ if and only if $\operatorname{fd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)) < \infty$. If $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$, then $X \in \mathcal{B}_C(R)$. Also we have $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X) < \infty$ if and only if $\operatorname{id}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X) < \infty$. Hence, if $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X) < \infty$, then $X \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$.

Remark 3.3. Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. Note that when $C = R$ we have that $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) = \sup(R) + \operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(R,X)) = \operatorname{pd}_R(X)$. Similarly in this case $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) = \operatorname{fd}_R(X)$ and $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X) = \operatorname{id}_R(X)$.

Remark 3.4. Let M be an R-module. When C is a semidualizing R-module, Takahashi and White [10, Theorem 2.11], using the definition described in Section 1, showed that $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) = \operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X))$. Since $\sup(C) = 0$ in this case, Definition 3.1(1) shows that our definition is consistent with the one from [10]. In a similar way, it can be shown that $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}$ recovers Takahashi and White's definition in this case.

The next result compares $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}$ with $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}$.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. Then*

$$\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) \leqslant \mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) \leqslant \mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) + \dim(R).$$

In particular if $\dim(R) < \infty$, then we have $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$.

Proof: Assume that $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) = n < \infty$. Then

$$\operatorname{fd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)) \leqslant \operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)) = n - \sup(C) < \infty.$$

It now follows that $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) \leqslant n$.

Next assume that $\dim(R) < \infty$ and $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) = n < \infty$. By [8] we have

$$\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)) \leqslant \operatorname{fd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)) + \dim(R) = n - \sup(C) + \dim(R).$$

Therefore $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) \leqslant \dim(R) + n$.

□

The following three results are versions of [10, Theorem 2.11] involving a semidaulizing complex.

Proposition 3.6. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. Then we have*

$$\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X) = \sup(C) + \operatorname{pd}_R(X).$$

In particular, $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X) < \infty$ if and only if $\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$.

Proof: Let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. We prove that $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X) \leqslant n$ if and only if $\sup(C) + \operatorname{pd}_R(X) \leqslant n$.

For the forward implication assume that $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X) \leqslant n$. Then by Definition 3.1(1) we have

$$\sup(C) + \operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X)) = \mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X) \leqslant n.$$

Thus $\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X)) < \infty$. Fact 2.7(a) implies $\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X) \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$. By Foxby Equivalence (2.6) we have $C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X \in \mathcal{B}_C(R)$ and $X \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$. Therefore we have $X \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X)$ and $\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X)) = \operatorname{pd}_R(X)$. Thus $\sup(C) + \operatorname{pd}_R(X) \leqslant n$.

For the reverse implication assume that $\sup(C) + \operatorname{pd}_R(X) \leqslant n$. In particular, we have that $\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$. Therefore $X \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$ and $X \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X)$. It follows that $\operatorname{pd}_R(X) = \operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X)$. By Definition 3.1(1) we have

$$\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X) = \sup(C) + \operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X)) = \sup(C) + \operatorname{pd}_R(X) \leqslant n.$$

□

The next two results are proven like Proposition 3.6.

Proposition 3.7. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. Then we have*

$$\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X) = \sup(C) + \operatorname{fd}_R(X).$$

In particular, $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X) < \infty$ if and only if $\operatorname{fd}_R(X) < \infty$.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. Then we have*

$$\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X)) = \sup(C) + \operatorname{id}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X).$$

In particular, $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X)) < \infty$ if and only if $\operatorname{id}_R(X) < \infty$.

Next, we have Theorem 1.1 from the introduction.

Theorem 3.9. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$.*

(a) *We have $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$ if and only if there exists $Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ such that $\operatorname{pd}_R(Y) < \infty$ and $X \simeq C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y$. When these conditions are satisfied, one has $Y \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X)$ and $X \in \mathcal{B}_C(R)$.*

(b) *We have $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$ if and only if there exists $Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ such that $\operatorname{fd}_R(Y) < \infty$ and $X \simeq C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y$. When these conditions are satisfied, one has $Y \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X)$ and $X \in \mathcal{B}_C(R)$.*

(c) *We have $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X) < \infty$ if and only if there exists $Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ such that $\operatorname{id}_R(Y) < \infty$ and $X \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, Y)$. When these conditions are satisfied, one has $Y \simeq C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X$ and $X \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$.*

Proof: (a) For the forward implication assume that $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$. Then by Definition 3.1(1) we have $\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X)) = \mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) - \sup(C) < \infty$. Fact 2.7(a) implies that $\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X) \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$ and Foxby Equivalence implies that $X \in \mathcal{B}_C(R)$. Thus $X \simeq C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X) \simeq C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y$ with $Y = \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X)$.

For the reverse implication assume that there exists a $Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ such that $\operatorname{pd}_R(Y) < \infty$ and $X \simeq C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y$. Then Fact 2.7(a) implies that $Y \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$ and hence we have

$$Y \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y) \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X).$$

It now follows by Definition 3.1(1) that $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$.

Parts (b) and (c) are proven similarly. □

The previous results give rise to a generalized Foxby Equivalence.

Theorem 3.10 (Foxby Equivalence)**.** *There is a commutative diagram*

$$\begin{array}{ccc}
\mathcal{I}_C(R) & \rightleftarrows & \mathcal{I}(R) \\
\downarrow & & \downarrow \\
\mathcal{A}_C(R) & \underset{\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(C,-)}{\overset{C\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R -}{\rightleftarrows}} & \mathcal{B}_C(R) \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow \\
\mathcal{F}(R) & \rightleftarrows & \mathcal{F}_C(R) \\
\uparrow & & \uparrow \\
\mathcal{P}(R) & \rightleftarrows & \mathcal{P}_C(R)
\end{array}$$

where the vertical arrows are full embeddings, and the unlabeled horizontal arrows are quasi-inverse equivalences of categories.

The next result shows how $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}$ and $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}$ transfer along a ring homomorphism of finite flat dimension. Note that if $\varphi : R \to S$ is a ring homomorphism of finite flat dimension, then $C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S$ is a semidualizing S-complex by [2, Theorem 5.6] and [4, Theorem II(a)].

Proposition 3.11. *Let $\varphi : R \to S$ be a ring homomorphism of finite flat dimension and $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. Then one has*

(a) $\mathcal{P}_{C\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_S(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) - \sup(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) \leqslant \mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) - \sup(C)$,
(b) $\mathcal{F}_{C\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_S(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) - \sup(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) \leqslant \mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) - \sup(C)$,
(c) $\mathcal{P}_{C\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_S(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) \leqslant \mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X)$, *and*
(d) $\mathcal{F}_{C\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_S(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) \leqslant \mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X)$.

Equality holds when φ is faithfully flat.

Proof: (a) and (c) Assume first that $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) - \sup(C) = n < \infty$. Then $\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(C, X)) = n$ and hence by base change we have

$$\operatorname{pd}_S(\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(C, X) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) \leqslant \operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(C, X)) = n.$$

Observe by tensor-evaluation (2.4) and Hom-tensor adjointness, there are isomorphisms

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(C, X) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S &\simeq \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(C, X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) \\
&\simeq \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(C, \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_S(S, X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S)) \\
&\simeq \mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_S(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S, X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S).
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore $\operatorname{pd}_S(\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_S(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S, X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S)) \leqslant n$. Thus we have

$$\mathcal{P}_{C\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_S(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) - \sup(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) \leqslant n = \mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) - \sup(C)$$

that is, the inequality in (a) holds.

Observe that since $\operatorname{fd}_R(S) < \infty$, we have $S \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$ and hence $\sup(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) \leqslant \sup(C)$ by [2, Proposition 4.8(a)]. Hence the inequality in (c) follows from part (a).

Now assume that φ is faithfully flat. Therefore one has that $\sup(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) = \sup(C)$. Hence it suffices to show that $\mathcal{P}_{C\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) \geqslant \mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X)$. Assume that $\mathcal{P}_{C\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) = n < \infty$. Then

$$\operatorname{pd}_S(\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(C, X) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S) = \operatorname{pd}_S(\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_S(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S, X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S)) = n - \sup(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S).$$

Therefore we have $\operatorname{pd}_S(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S)\leqslant n-\sup(C)$. Observe that if P is an R-module such that $P\otimes_R S$ is projective over S, then P is projective over R by [7, Theorem 9.6] and [8]. A standard truncation argument thus shows that

$$\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X))\leqslant \operatorname{pd}_S(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R S)=n-\sup(C)$$

as desired.

Parts (d) and (b) are proven similarly. □

Corollary 3.12. *Let $X\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$, and let $U\subset R$ be a multiplicatively closed subset. Then there are equalities*

(a) $\mathcal{P}_{U^{-1}C}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{U^{-1}R}(U^{-1}X)\leqslant \mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X)$,
(b) $\mathcal{F}_{U^{-1}C}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{U^{-1}R}(U^{-1}X)\leqslant \mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X)$,
(c) $\mathcal{I}_{U^{-1}C}\text{-}\operatorname{id}_{U^{-1}R}(U^{-1}X)\leqslant \mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X)$,
(d) $\mathcal{P}_{U^{-1}C}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{U^{-1}R}(U^{-1}X)-\sup(U^{-1}C)\leqslant \mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X)-\sup(C)$,
(e) $\mathcal{F}_{U^{-1}C}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{U^{-1}R}(U^{-1}X)-\sup(U^{-1}C)\leqslant \mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X)-\sup(C)$, *and*
(f) $\mathcal{I}_{U^{-1}C}\text{-}\operatorname{id}_{U^{-1}R}(U^{-1}X)-\sup(U^{-1}C)\leqslant \mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X)-\sup(C)$.

Proof: The map $\varphi: R\to U^{-1}R$ is flat. Hence (a), (b), (d), and (e) follow from Proposition 3.11. Parts (c) and (f) are proven similarly to Proposition 3.11. □

Remark 3.13. Observe that to obtain the inequality in Corollary 3.12 we need the inequality $\sup(U^{-1}C)\leqslant\sup(C)$ to hold. If we had defined $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X)$ as $\inf(C)+\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X))$, then Corollarly 3.12 would not hold because $\inf(U^{-1}C)\not\leqslant\inf(C)$. This is why we choose $\sup(C)$ instead of $\inf(C)$ in the definition of $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}$.

The next result is a local-global principal for Bass classes.

Lemma 3.14. *Let $X\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $X\in\mathcal{B}_C(R)$;
(ii) $U^{-1}X\in\mathcal{B}_{U^{-1}C}(U^{-1}R)$ *all multiplicatively closed subsets $U\subset R$;*
(iii) $X_{\mathfrak{p}}\in\mathcal{B}_{C_{\mathfrak{p}}}(R_{\mathfrak{p}})$ *for all $\mathfrak{p}\in\operatorname{Spec}(R)$;*
(iv) $X_{\mathfrak{p}}\in\mathcal{B}_{C_{\mathfrak{p}}}(R_{\mathfrak{p}})$ *for all $\mathfrak{p}\in\operatorname{Supp}(R)$;*
(v) $X_{\mathfrak{m}}\in\mathcal{B}_{C_{\mathfrak{m}}}(R_{\mathfrak{m}})$ *for all $\mathfrak{m}\in\operatorname{Max}(R)$; and*
(vi) $X_{\mathfrak{m}}\in\mathcal{B}_{C_{\mathfrak{m}}}(R_{\mathfrak{m}})$ *for all $\mathfrak{m}\in\operatorname{Supp}(R)\cap\operatorname{Max}(R)$.*

Proof: The implications (i) ⇒ (ii) ⇒ (iii) ⇒ (iv) ⇒ (vi) and (iii) ⇒ (v) ⇒ (vi) follow from definitions. We prove (v) ⇒ (i) and (vi) ⇒ (v).

For the implication (v) ⇒ (i), assume $X_{\mathfrak{m}}\in\mathcal{B}_{C_{\mathfrak{m}}}(R_{\mathfrak{m}})$ for all $\mathfrak{m}\in\operatorname{Max}(R)$. We use the following commutative diagram in $\mathcal{D}(R)$:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} C_{\mathfrak{m}}\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_{R_{\mathfrak{m}}}\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)_{\mathfrak{m}} & \xrightarrow{\simeq} & \big[C\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)\big]_{\mathfrak{m}} \\ \downarrow\simeq & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle(\xi^C_X)_{\mathfrak{m}}} \\ C_{\mathfrak{m}}\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_{R_{\mathfrak{m}}}\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_{R_{\mathfrak{m}}}(C_{\mathfrak{m}},X_{\mathfrak{m}}) & \xrightarrow{\xi^{C_{\mathfrak{m}}}_{X_{\mathfrak{m}}}} & X_{\mathfrak{m}}. \end{array}$$

As $X_{\mathfrak{m}}\in\mathcal{B}_{C_{\mathfrak{m}}}(R_{\mathfrak{m}})$ for all $\mathfrak{m}\in\operatorname{Max}(R)$, the morphism $\xi^{C_{\mathfrak{m}}}_{X_{\mathfrak{m}}}$ is an isomorphism for all $\mathfrak{m}\in\operatorname{Max}(R)$. Commutativity of the above diagram now forces $(\xi^C_X)_{\mathfrak{m}}$ to be an isomrophism for all $\mathfrak{m}\in\operatorname{Max}(R)$. Therefore ξ^C_X is an isomorphism.

It remains to show that $\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)\in\mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. As $\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)\in\mathcal{D}_-(R)$, it suffices to show that $\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)\in\mathcal{D}_+(R)$. By assumption $X_{\mathfrak{m}}\in\mathcal{B}_{C_{\mathfrak{m}}}(R_{\mathfrak{m}})$.

Then for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{Max}(R)$ we have

$$\begin{aligned}\inf(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)_\mathfrak{m}) &= \inf(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_{R_\mathfrak{m}}(C_\mathfrak{m}, X_\mathfrak{m})) \\ &\geqslant \inf(X_\mathfrak{m}) - \sup(C_\mathfrak{m}) \\ &\geqslant \inf(X) - \sup(C)\end{aligned}$$

where the equality is by the isomorphism $\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)_\mathfrak{m} \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_{R_\mathfrak{m}}(C_\mathfrak{m}, X_\mathfrak{m})$, the first inequality is by [2, Proposition 4.8(c)], and the second inequality is by properties of localization. Thus $\inf(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)) \geqslant \inf(X) - \sup(C) > -\infty$.

For the implication (vi) $\Rightarrow$ (v), assume $X_\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{B}_{C_\mathfrak{m}}(R_\mathfrak{m})$ for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{Supp}_R(X) \cap \operatorname{Max}(R)$. Then for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{Max}(R) \setminus \operatorname{Supp}_R(X)$ we have $X_\mathfrak{m} \simeq 0 \in \mathcal{B}_{C_\mathfrak{m}}(R_\mathfrak{m})$, as desired. □

The following is proven similarly to Lemma 3.14

Lemma 3.15. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $X \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$;
(ii) $U^{-1}X \in \mathcal{A}_{U^{-1}C}(U^{-1}R)$ *all multiplicatively closed subsets* $U \subset R$;
(iii) $X_\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{A}_{C_\mathfrak{p}}(R_\mathfrak{p})$ *for all* $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec}(R)$;
(iv) $X_\mathfrak{p} \in \mathcal{A}_{C_\mathfrak{p}}(R_\mathfrak{p})$ *for all* $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Supp}(R)$;
(v) $X_\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{A}_{C_\mathfrak{m}}(R_\mathfrak{m})$ *for all* $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{Max}(R)$; *and*
(vi) $X_\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{A}_{C_\mathfrak{m}}(R_\mathfrak{m})$ *for all* $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{Supp}(R) \cap \operatorname{Max}(R)$.

Proposition 3.16. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ and let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. Consider the following conditions:*

(i) $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) - \sup(C) \leqslant n$;
(ii) $\mathcal{P}_{U^{-1}C}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{U^{-1}R}(U^{-1}X) - \sup(U^{-1}C) \leqslant n$ *for each multiplicatively closed subset* $U \subset R$;
(iii) $\mathcal{P}_{C_\mathfrak{p}}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{R_\mathfrak{p}}(X_\mathfrak{p}) - \sup(C_\mathfrak{p}) \leqslant n$ *for each* $\mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec}(R)$; *and*
(iv) $\mathcal{P}_{C_\mathfrak{m}}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{R_\mathfrak{m}}(X_\mathfrak{m}) - \sup(C_\mathfrak{m}) \leqslant n$ *for each* $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{Max}(R)$.

Then (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv). *Furthermore, if $X \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{f}}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$, then* (iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i) *and*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) - c &= \sup\left\{ \begin{array}{l|l} \mathcal{P}_{U^{-1}C}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{U^{-1}R}(U^{-1}X) & U \subset R \text{ is} \\ -\sup(U^{-1}C) & \text{multiplicatively} \\ & \text{closed} \end{array} \right\} \\ &= \sup\{\mathcal{P}_{C_\mathfrak{p}}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{R_\mathfrak{p}}(X_\mathfrak{p}) - \sup(C_\mathfrak{p}) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec}(R)\} \\ &= \sup\{\mathcal{P}_{C_\mathfrak{m}}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{R_\mathfrak{m}}(X_\mathfrak{m}) - \sup(C_\mathfrak{m}) \mid \mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{Max}(R)\}\end{aligned}$$

where $c = \sup(C)$.

Proof: Observe that (i) $\Rightarrow$ (ii) follows from Proposition 3.11. The implications (ii) $\Rightarrow$ (iii) $\Rightarrow$ (iv) follow from properties of localization. For the rest of the proof assume that $X \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{f}}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$.

For the implication (iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i) assume that $\mathcal{P}_{C_\mathfrak{m}}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{R_\mathfrak{m}}(X_\mathfrak{m}) - \sup(C_\mathfrak{m}) \leqslant n < \infty$ for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{Max}(R)$. Then by Remark 3.2 we have $X_\mathfrak{m} \in \mathcal{B}_{C_\mathfrak{m}}(R_\mathfrak{m})$ for all $\mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{Max}(R)$. Therefore Lemma 3.14 implies that $X \in \mathcal{B}_C(R)$ and hence

$\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(C,X) \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. Now

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) - \sup(C) &= \operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_R(C,X)) \\ &= \sup_{\mathfrak{m}\in\operatorname{Max}(R)} (\operatorname{pd}_{R_\mathfrak{m}}(\mathbf{R}\mathrm{Hom}_{R_\mathfrak{m}}(C_\mathfrak{m},X_\mathfrak{m}))) \\ &\leqslant n\end{aligned}$$

where the second equality is by [1, Proposition 5.3P].

For the equalities, assume first that $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) - \sup(C) = n < \infty$. Then each displayed supremum in the statement is at most n. If any of the supremums are strictly less than n, then the above equivalence will force $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) - \sup(C) < n$, contradicting our assumption. A similar argument establishes the desired equalities if we assume any of the supremums equal n.

Finally if any of the displayed values in the statement are infinite, then the above equivalences forces the other values to be infinite as well. □

To prove the implication (iv) $\Rightarrow$ (i) in Proposition 3.16, the condition $X \in \mathcal{D}^{\mathrm{f}}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ is required. However the flat and injective versions only require $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$; see [1, Propositions 5.3F,5.3I]. Thus the next two results are proven similarly to Proposition 3.16.

Proposition 3.17. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ and let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) - \sup(C) \leqslant n$;
(ii) $\mathcal{F}_{U^{-1}C}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{U^{-1}R}(U^{-1}X) - \sup(U^{-1}C) \leqslant n$ *for each multiplicatively closed subset* $U \subset R$;
(iii) $\mathcal{F}_{C_\mathfrak{p}}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{R_\mathfrak{p}}(X_\mathfrak{p}) - \sup(C_\mathfrak{p}) \leqslant n$ *for each prime ideal* $\mathfrak{p} \subset R$; *and*
(iv) $\mathcal{F}_{C_\mathfrak{m}}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{R_\mathfrak{m}}(X_\mathfrak{m}) - \sup(C_\mathfrak{m}) \leqslant n$ *for each maximal ideal* $\mathfrak{m} \subset R$.

Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) - c &= \sup\left\{ \begin{array}{l|l} \mathcal{F}_{U^{-1}C}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{U^{-1}R}(U^{-1}X) & U \subset R \text{ is} \\ -\sup(U^{-1}C) & \text{multiplicatively} \\ & \text{closed} \end{array} \right\} \\ &= \sup\{\mathcal{F}_{C_\mathfrak{p}}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{R_\mathfrak{p}}(X_\mathfrak{p}) - \sup(C_\mathfrak{p}) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec}(R)\} \\ &= \sup\{\mathcal{F}_{C_\mathfrak{m}}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_{R_\mathfrak{m}}(X_\mathfrak{m}) - \sup(C_\mathfrak{m}) \mid \mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{Max}(R)\}\end{aligned}$$

where $c = \sup(C)$.

Proposition 3.18. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ and let $n \in \mathbb{Z}$. The following conditions are equqivalent:*

(i) $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X) - \sup(C) \leqslant n$;
(ii) $\mathcal{I}_{U^{-1}C}\text{-}\operatorname{id}_{U^{-1}R}(U^{-1}X) - \sup(U^{-1}C) \leqslant n$ *for each multiplicatively closed subset* $U \subset R$;
(iii) $\mathcal{I}_{C_\mathfrak{p}}\text{-}\operatorname{id}_{R_\mathfrak{p}}(X_\mathfrak{p}) - \sup(C_\mathfrak{p}) \leqslant n$ *for each prime ideal* $\mathfrak{p} \subset R$; *and*
(iv) $\mathcal{I}_{C_\mathfrak{m}}\text{-}\operatorname{id}_{R_\mathfrak{m}}(X_\mathfrak{m}) - \sup(C_\mathfrak{m}) \leqslant n$ *for each maximal ideal* $\mathfrak{m} \subset R$.

Furthermore

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X) - c &= \sup\left\{ \begin{array}{l|l} \operatorname{id}_{U^{-1}R}(U^{-1}C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_{U^{-1}R} U^{-1}X) & U \subset R \text{ is} \\ -\sup(U^{-1}C) & \text{multiplicatively} \\ & \text{closed} \end{array} \right\} \\ &= \sup\{\operatorname{id}_{R_\mathfrak{p}}\text{-}\operatorname{id}_{R_\mathfrak{p}}(C_\mathfrak{p} \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_{R_\mathfrak{p}} X_\mathfrak{p}) - \sup(C_\mathfrak{m}) \mid \mathfrak{p} \in \operatorname{Spec}(R)\} \\ &= \sup\{\operatorname{id}_{R_\mathfrak{m}}\text{-}\operatorname{id}_{R_\mathfrak{m}}(C_\mathfrak{m} \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_{R_\mathfrak{m}} X_\mathfrak{m}) - \sup(C_\mathfrak{m}) \mid \mathfrak{m} \in \operatorname{Max}(R)\}\end{aligned}$$

where $c = \sup(C)$.

Remark 3.19. When C is a semidualizing R-module, e.g., $C = R$, we recover the known local-global conditions for $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}$, $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}$, $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}$, pd, fd, and id.

4. Stability Results

In this section we investigate the behaviour of $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}$, $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}$, and $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}$ after applying the functors $\otimes^{\mathbf{L}}$ and $\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}$.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. The following inequalities hold:*
(a) $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y) \leqslant \mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) + \operatorname{pd}_R(Y)$*;*
(b) $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X, Y)) \leqslant \mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) + \operatorname{id}_R(Y)$*; and*
(c) $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y) \leqslant \mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) + \operatorname{fd}_R(Y)$.

Proof: (a) Without loss of generality we assume that $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$ and $\operatorname{pd}_R(Y) < \infty$. It now follows that $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) = \sup(C) + \operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X))$. By [1, Theorem 4.1 (P)] we have that

$$\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y) \leqslant \operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X)) + \operatorname{pd}_R(Y).$$

Since $\operatorname{pd}_R(Y) < \infty$ (hence $\operatorname{fd}_R(Y) < \infty$) we get tensor-evaluation (2.4) is an isomorphism in $\mathcal{D}(R)$. That is $\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y) \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y$. Hence we have

$$\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y)) \leqslant \operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, X)) + \operatorname{pd}_R(Y).$$

By adding a $\sup(C)$ to each side we see that $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y) \leqslant \mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) + \operatorname{pd}_R(Y)$.

(b) and (c) are proven similarly to (a). □

Corollary 4.2. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_b(R)$. The following inequalities hold:*
(a) $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, Y)) \leqslant \mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) + \mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(Y) - \sup(C)$*;*
(b) $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X, C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y)) \leqslant \mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) + \mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(Y) - \sup(C)$*; and*
(c) $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, Y)) \leqslant \mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}(RX) + \mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(Y) - \sup(C)$.

Proof: (a) By Proposition 4.1(a) we have that $\mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, Y)) \leqslant \mathcal{P}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) + \operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, Y))$. Add and subtract $\sup(C)$ to the right hand side to obtain the result.

(b) and (c) are proven similarly. □

The next result is a version of Fact 2.2 involving a semidualizing complex.

Proposition 4.3. *Let $X, Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$.*
(a) *If $\operatorname{id}_R(Y) < \infty$, then $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X, Y)) \leqslant \mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X) + \sup(Y)$.*
(b) *If $\operatorname{fd}_R(Y) < \infty$, then $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y) \leqslant \mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X) - \inf(Y)$.*

Proof: (a) Assume that $\mathrm{id}_R(Y) < \infty$. By applying Defintion 3.1 we get that $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,Y)) = \sup(C) + \operatorname{fd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,Y)))$. Observe by Hom-Tensor adjointness there is an isomorphism

$$\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,Y)) \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X, Y).$$

Therefore $\operatorname{fd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,Y)) = \operatorname{fd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X, Y))$. Hence by Fact 2.2(a) we have that

$$\operatorname{fd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X, Y) \leqslant \mathrm{id}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X) + \sup(Y).$$

By adding $\sup(C)$ to each side of the above inequality we obtain the desired result.

(b) is proven similarly. □

Proposition 4.4. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$;
(ii) $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\mathrm{id}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,Y)) < \infty$ *for all* $Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ *such that* $\mathrm{id}_R(Y) < \infty$; *and*
(iii) $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\mathrm{id}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,E)) < \infty$ *for some faithfully injective R-module E.*

Proof: (i)⇒(ii) This follows from Proposition 4.1(b).

(ii)⇒(iii) Since E is a faithfully injective module it has $\mathrm{id}_R(E) = 0 < \infty$. Therefore (ii) implies that $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\mathrm{id}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,E)) < \infty$.

(iii)⇒(i) Assume that there exists a faithfully injective R-module E such that $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\mathrm{id}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,E)) < \infty$. Then by Definition 3.1(3) $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\mathrm{id}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,E)) = \sup(C) + \mathrm{id}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,E))$. By Hom-evaluation (2.4) there is an isomorphism

$$\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X), E) \simeq C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,E).$$

It follows that $\mathrm{id}_R(C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,E)) = \mathrm{id}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X),E)) < \infty$. Therefore by Lemma 2.3 $\operatorname{fd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C,X)) < \infty$. It now follows that $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$. □

The following three propositions are proven similarly to Proposition 4.4.

Proposition 4.5. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$;
(ii) $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y) < \infty$ *for all* $Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ *such that* $\operatorname{fd}_R(Y) < \infty$;
(iii) $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R F) < \infty$ *for some faithfully flat R-module F.*

Proposition 4.6. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\mathrm{id}_R(X) < \infty$;
(ii) $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,Y)) < \infty$ *for all* $Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ *such that* $\mathrm{id}_R(Y) < \infty$;
(iii) $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,E)) < \infty$ *for some faithfully injective R-module E.*

Proposition 4.7. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(i) $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\mathrm{id}_R(X) < \infty$;
(ii) $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\mathrm{id}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R Y) < \infty$ *for all* $Y \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ *such that* $\operatorname{fd}_R(Y) < \infty$;
(iii) $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\mathrm{id}_R(X \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R F) < \infty$ *for some faithfully flat R-module F.*

Corollary 4.8. *Let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$ and. If there exists a dualizing complex D and $\mathcal{F}_C\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$, then $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\mathrm{id}_R(X^\dagger) < \infty$ where $X^\dagger = \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(X,D)$.*

Proof: Since D is a dualizing complex, it has finite injective dimension. Therefore the result follows from Proposition 4.4. □

The last result of this paper establishes Theorem 1.2 from the introduction.

Theorem 4.9. *Assume R has a dualizing complex D and let $X \in \mathcal{D}_{\mathrm{b}}(R)$. Then $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X) < \infty$ if and only if $\mathcal{F}_{C^\dagger}\text{-}\operatorname{pd}_R(X) < \infty$ where $C^\dagger = \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, D)$.*

Proof: For the forward implication assume that $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X) < \infty$. Then set $J = C \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R X$. Since $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X) < \infty$ we have that J has finite injective dimension. By Remark 3.2 we have $X \in \mathcal{A}_C(R)$. This explains the first isomorphism in the following display:

$$X \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, J) \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C^\dagger, D), J) \simeq C^\dagger \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(D, J).$$

The second isomorphism is from the isomorphism $C \simeq C^{\dagger\dagger}$, and the third is by Hom-evaluation (2.4). Observe that since $\operatorname{id}_R(D) < \infty$ and $\operatorname{id}_R(J) < \infty$ we have that $\operatorname{fd}_R(\mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(D, J)) < \infty$ by Fact 2.2(a). Thus, it follows that $\mathcal{F}_{C^\dagger}\text{-}\operatorname{fd}_R(X) < \infty$ by the displayed isomorphisms.

For the reverse implication assume that $\mathcal{F}_{C^\dagger}\text{-}\operatorname{fd}_R(X) < \infty$. Then we can write $X \simeq C^\dagger \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R F$ where $F = \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C^\dagger, X)$ and $\operatorname{fd}_R(F) < \infty$. We then have the following isomorphisms:

$$X \simeq C^\dagger \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R F = \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, D) \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R F \simeq \mathbf{R}\operatorname{Hom}_R(C, D \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R F)$$

where the second isomorphism is by tensor-evaluation (2.4). Since $\operatorname{id}_R(D) < \infty$ and $\operatorname{fd}_R(F) < \infty$ we have that $\operatorname{id}_R(D \otimes^{\mathbf{L}}_R F) < \infty$ by Fact 2.2(b). Hence $\mathcal{I}_C\text{-}\operatorname{id}_R(X) < \infty$ by Theorem 3.9(c) as desired. □

References

[1] L. L. Avramov and H.-B. Foxby. Homological dimensions of unbounded complexes. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 71:129–155, 1991.

[2] L. W. Christensen. Semi-dualizing complexes and their Auslander categories. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 353(5):1839–1883, 2001.

[3] H.-B. Foxby. Bounded complexes of flat modules. *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 15(2):149–172, 1979.

[4] A. Frankild and S. Sather-Wagstaff. Reflexivity and ring homomorphisms of finite flat dimension. *Comm. Algebra*, 35(2):461–500, 2007.

[5] S. I. Gelfand and Y. I. Manin. *Methods of homological algebra*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1996.

[6] R. Hartshorne. *Residues and duality*. Lecture Notes in Mathematics, No. 20. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1966.

[7] A. Perry. Faithfully flat descent for projectivity of modules. *ArXiv e-prints*, October 2010.

[8] M. Raynaud and L. Gruson. Critères de platitude et de projectivité. Techniques de "platification" d'un module. *Invent. Math.*, 13:1–89, 1971.

[9] S. Sather-Wagstaff and J. Totushek. Finiteness of homological dimensions with respect to a semidualizing complex. In preparation.

[10] R. Takahashi and D. White. Homological aspects of semidualizing modules. *Math. Scand.*, 106(1):5–22, 2010.